

UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/28/2005

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/658,571	09/09/2003	Hitoshi Tamashiro	075834.00439	3415
33448	7590 11/28/2005		EXAMINER	
ROBERT J. DEPKE			CANNING, ANTHONY J	
LEWIS T. STEADMAN			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
TREXLER, BUSHNELL, GLANGLORGI, BLACKSTONE & MARR			AKTONII	TALER NOMBER
105 WEST ADAMS STREET, SUITE 3600			2879	
CHICAGO, IL 60603-6299			DATE MAILED, 11/20/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

AK
11 —

Advisory Action

Application No.	Applicant(s)
10/658,571	TAMASHIRO ET AL.
Examiner	Art Unit
Anthony J. Canning	2879

Advisory Action	10/658,5/1 TAMASHIRO ET AL.					
Before the Filing of an Appeal Brief	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Anthony J. Canning	2879				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ears on the cover sheet with the c	orrespondence address				
THE REPLY FILED 05 November 2005 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE.						
 The reply was filed after a final rejection, but prior to or on the same day as filing a Notice of Appeal. To avoid abandonment of this application, applicant must timely file one of the following replies: (1) an amendment, affidavit, or other evidence, which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee) in compliance with 37 CFR 41.31; or (3) a Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114. The reply must be filed within one of the following time periods: a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. 						
b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In						
no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. Examiner Note: If box 1 is checked, check either box (a) or (b). ONLY CHECK BOX (b) WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).						
Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b). NOTICE OF APPEAL						
2. The Notice of Appeal was filed on A brief in compliance with 37 CFR 41.37 must be filed within two months of the date of filing the Notice of Appeal (37 CFR 41.37(a)), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 41.37(e)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal. Since a Notice of Appeal has been filed, any reply must be filed within the time period set forth in 37 CFR 41.37(a). AMENDMENTS						
3. The proposed amendment(s) filed after a final rejection, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because (a) They raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);						
 (b) ☐ They raise the issue of new matter (see NOTE below) (c) ☐ They are not deemed to place the application in be 		ducing or simplifying the issues for				
appeal; and/or (d) They present additional claims without canceling a	corresponding number of finally rej	ected claims.				
NOTE: (See 37 CFR 1.116 and 41.33(a)).						
4. The amendments are not in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121. See attached Notice of Non-Compliant Amendment (PTOL-324). 5. Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s):						
6. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would be a non-allowable claim(s).		timely filed amendment canceling t	the			
7. For purposes of appeal, the proposed amendment(s): a) will not be entered, or b) will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.						
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows: Claim(s) allowed: Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:	Claim(s) rejected: Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:					
AFFIDAVIT OR OTHER EVIDENCE 8. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence filed after a final action, but before or on the date of filing a Notice of Appeal will <u>not</u> be entered because applicant failed to provide a showing of good and sufficient reasons why the affidavit or other evidence is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 1.116(e).						
9. The affidavit or other evidence filed after the date of filing a Notice of Appeal, but prior to the date of filing a brief, will <u>not</u> be entered because the affidavit or other evidence failed to overcome <u>all</u> rejections under appeal and/or appellant fails to provide a showing a good and sufficient reasons why it is necessary and was not earlier presented. See 37 CFR 41.33(d)(1).						
10. ☐ The affidavit or other evidence is entered. An explanation of the status of the claims after entry is below or attached. REQUEST FOR RECONSIDERATION/OTHER 11. ☐ The request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because:						
See Continuation Sheet. 12. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s). 13. ☐ Other:	(PTO/SB/08 or PTO-1449) Paper N	John Manch				
		ashok patel Prinjary examiner				

Continuation of 11. does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: The claims as finally rejected do not distinguish the claimed device and method from the cited prior art.

Further, Applicant argues that the finality of the office actin was inappropriate and taught away from the claimed invention. Taniguichi teaches a groove on a sealing substrate which catches adhesive, which are commonly resins, as stated in claim 1. Regardless of its intended use, the groove is structurally the same as the one claimed in the invention. Regarding the relief portion 54, it also acts as a resevoir for catching material, structurally it can also catch resin although the intended use may be different. It has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device involves only routine skill in the art. St. Regis Paper Co. v. Bemis Co., 193 USPQ 8. Regarding the moisture absorption particles will roughen the surface by adding material to the interior of the groove. No official notice needs to be given, since it is inherent that particles on a surface "roughen" the surface because the surface is not longer flat. The claim language only states that the groove is on the sealing substrate and collects excess resin, and does not mention an inward flow of resin.